

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN  
SOUTHERN DIVISION

STACEY R. SMITH,

Plaintiff,

Hon. Janet T. Neff

v.

Case No. 1:10-cv-00702

ADVANCED RADIOLOGY, et al.,

Defendants.

\_\_\_\_\_ /

**REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION**

Plaintiff has initiated the present action against Advanced Radiology (Dkt. 1). The Court has granted Plaintiff's motion to proceed as a pauper in this matter (Dkt. 4). Having granted Plaintiff's motion to proceed as a pauper, the Court has conducted an initial review of the complaint pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2) to determine whether it is frivolous, malicious, or fails to state a claim upon which relief can be granted. Having conducted this initial review, the Court concludes that Plaintiff's complaint must be dismissed for failure to state a claim upon which relief may be granted.

Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(6), a claim may be dismissed for failure to state a claim upon which relief may be granted where, even accepting as true Plaintiff's allegations and construing the complaint liberally in Plaintiff's favor, it appears "beyond doubt that the plaintiff can prove no set of facts in support of his claim which would entitle him to relief."

*Herron v. Harrison*, 203 F.3d 410, 414 (6th Cir. 2000) (quoting *Estelle v. Gamble*, 429 U.S. 97, 106 (1976)).

It appears that the Court does not have jurisdiction over the claim Plaintiff is attempting to bring. Plaintiff objects to judgment entered by the Honorable Kimberly A. Schaefer of the 61st District Court in Kent County, Michigan. This Court does not have jurisdiction to review civil state court orders or judgments. As such, the Complaint asserts no facts which, if proven, would entitle Plaintiff to relief in this Court. The undersigned recommends that Plaintiff's action be dismissed.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: August 20, 2010

/s/ Ellen S. Carmody  
ELLEN S. CARMODY  
United States Magistrate Judge

OBJECTIONS to this Report and Recommendation must be filed with the Clerk of Court within 14 days of the date of service of this notice. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C). Failure to file objections within the specified time waives the right to appeal the District Court's order. *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 155 (1985); *United States v. Walters*, 638 F.2d 947, 949-50 (6th Cir. 1981).